

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Final Office Action mailed February 6, 2007, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action, claims 13 and 15-17 are objected to for certain informalities. In response, claim 16 has been canceled without prejudice, and claims 13, 15 and 17 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Further, claims 11-12 and 19-20 have been amended for better clarity. It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 13 and 15-17 has been overcome and an indication as such is respectfully requested. Claims 11-13, 15, 17 and 19-20 were not amended in order to address issues of patentability and Applicants respectfully reserve all rights under the Doctrine of Equivalents. Applicants furthermore reserve the right to reintroduce subject matter deleted herein at a later time during the prosecution of this application or continuing applications.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as allegedly indefinite since claims 1 and 18 do not define the pattern and the function of the pattern does not specify the scope for the structure of the lamp. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that "a pattern configured to increase a diffuseness of the discharge arc," as recited in claims 1 and 18 is definite and a clear structural feature. Page 3, second paragraph of the Final Office Action states that for "examination purposes, the examiner will take the pattern to be a layer that increase diffuseness of the lamp." (Emphasis added)

It is respectfully submitted that a layer including the pattern is one embodiment of the present invention. Other embodiments, such as recited in claim 7, include the pattern on the inner vessel or the outer bulb where, for example, the pattern may be on the outer surface (of the inner vessel or the outer bulb) facing away from the discharge arc, on the outer surface facing the discharge arc, or within the inner vessel or bulb material.

It is respectfully submitted that a bulb having a pattern configured to increase a diffuseness of the discharge arc (as

Amendment in Reply to Final Office Action mailed on February 6, 2007

recited in claims 1 and 18) is just as definite as a bulb having "a layer that increase diffuseness of the lamp," as assumed by the Examiner. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-20 is respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-4, 6-8 and 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,723,937 (Whitman). Further, claims 5 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Whitman. In response, claim 16 has been canceled without prejudice, and a feature thereof included in independent claims 1 and 18. Thus, entry of the present amendment is respectfully requested. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-15 and 17-20 are patentable Whitman for at least the following reasons.

Whitman is directed to a directed to a lamp having a light-scattering coating 26. As shown in FIG 1(b), the light-scattering coating 26 includes particles that are separated from each other.

In stark contract, the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 18, amongst other patentable elements requires (illustrative emphasis provided):

Amendment in Reply to Final Office Action mailed on February 6, 2007

an outer bulb, wherein at least one of the inner vessel and the outer bulb comprises a pattern configured to increase a diffuseness of the discharge arc, wherein the pattern includes shapes which are overlapping.

A pattern that includes shapes which are overlapping is nowhere taught or suggested in Whitman. Rather, Whitman teaches a light-scattering coating 26 that includes particles that are separated from each other.


Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 18 should be allowable, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-15, 17 and 19-20 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claims 1 and 18.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

Amendment in Reply to Final Office Action mailed on February 6, 2007

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
March 12, 2007

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101